

THE GREEKS
UNDER
THE ROMAN EMPIRE

A. H. M. JONES

THE most surprising feature of Roman rule in the Greek East is that despite its long duration it had so little effect on the civilization of the area. The influence was indeed in the other direction. In Horace's much quoted phrase *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit*. Even in the late third century an important group of Roman noble families became deeply imbued with Greek culture, and as time went on every cultivated Roman came to receive a Greek education, to read Greek literature, to study Greek rhetoric and philosophy. Many Romans were as at home in Greek as in Latin. Cicero in his letters often uses a Greek phrase to convey a nuance too subtle for Latin; Marcus Aurelius wrote his intimate memoirs in Greek. Roman aristocrats, though they might have a low opinion of contemporary Greeks, had a profound reverence for Greek civilization and were deeply imbued with its culture.

This feeling was not reciprocated. Some Greeks might admire the political wisdom of the Romans and all were impressed by their military power, but they never ceased to regard them culturally as barbarians. The Greeks were supremely satisfied with their own language and literature, and, except for a few antiquarians like Plutarch, who were curious about Roman history and institutions, felt no call to learn the barbarous Latin tongue or read its uncouth and imitative literature.

The result was that the Greeks had no impulse to Romanize themselves, and the Roman government felt no mission to impose their civilization on the East. In the barbarian West the natives quickly adopted Roman culture, and the government encouraged them by appropriate grants of status. Countless communities were converted into *municipia* of Roman citizens, and whole provinces accorded the Latin right. Nothing of the kind happened in the East. Nowhere was *Latinitas* granted, and the *municipia* of the Greek world number precisely three, Stobi and Denda in Macedonia, and Coela in the Thracian Chersonnese. There was, moreover, relatively little Roman colonization in the East. Caesar, the triumvirs, and Augustus planted twenty odd colonies of veterans, nine or ten in Greece and Macedonia, ten in various parts of Asia Minor, and one in Syria. Later emperors added about a dozen colonies to the list. It is very unlikely that any programme of Romanization lay behind these foundations. Some, like Corinth and Aelia Capitolina, were revivals of destroyed cities, others were perhaps designed as fortresses to control turbulent areas; this motive may explain Augustus' Pisidian group. But for the most part the founders were merely concerned to provide land for their veterans, and founded colonies where it was available; hence the large number of settlements planted by Caesar, the triumvirs, and Augustus, who had exceptionally large numbers of veterans for whom they had to provide.¹

¹ Pliny, *NH* III. 145 (Denda), ib. IV. 34, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 245 (Stobi), *Année Epigr.* 1924, 82, Head, *Hist. Num.*², p. 259 (Coela). It is difficult to prove a negative, but if any other *municipia* had existed, their coins or inscriptions would probably have survived. For Roman colonization in the East see my *Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, pp. 60–64.

These colonies were gradually assimilated to their Greek environment: one can trace on their inscriptions and coins the supersession of Latin by Greek. Outside the colonies Latin can rarely have been heard. The administrative language of the Roman Empire in the eastern provinces was Greek. The emperors had a special bureau *ab epistolis Graecis* to handle their correspondence with Greek cities and provincial assemblies. Edicts were published in Greek; rescripts to Greek petitions were given in the same language; in the law courts proceedings were conducted in Greek. The proconsuls, legates, procurators, and other officials were drawn from the stratum of Roman society to which Greek was a second language. Only in the army was Latin the official language, and even here it became increasingly merely official. Regimental records and accounts were kept in Latin, and Latin was no doubt the language of command. But the eastern legions were from the beginning of the principate, and indeed earlier, largely recruited locally from men whose native language was Greek, and in their private correspondence, as we know from the papyri, the soldiers generally used that language, though they presumably had to learn enough Latin to understand their orders. In the East the army was not, as in the western provinces, a force making for Romanization. The garrison towns remained Greek and no Roman *municipia* arose from the legionary *canabae*.²

Roman citizenship remained rare in the Greek East until the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in 212 abruptly made all free inhabitants of the Empire Romans. The only communities of citizens were the few colonies and the even fewer *municipia*. A certain number of Greeks acquired the citizenship by enrollment in the legions, or after their discharge, by service in the *auxilia*. The citizenship was also granted on a fairly liberal scale to individuals, chiefly the notables of their cities. But the proportion of Roman citizens must have been minute.

It follows that Roman law was rarely applicable in the Greek East. It was the law of the colonies and *municipia*, but the vast majority of cities followed their own codes, and Greek law prevailed in Egypt. For normal purposes the isolated Roman citizens scattered among the Greek population conformed to the local law. Only for certain aspects of family law was a Roman citizen obliged to follow Roman rules. He was, for instance, supposed to make his will in Latin. But in Egypt Roman citizens often tried to evade even this rule, and drew up their wills in Greek, adding a clause declaring that their provisions should be valid as if written in Latin; such wills were declared invalid by the Idios Logos. Here again the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in theory revolutionized the situation; Roman law was thenceforth universally applicable, and

² An imperial secretary *ad legationes et responsa Graeca* (*Année Epigr.* 1924, 78) or ἐπὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἀποκριμάτων (Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ 804) is recorded as early as the reign of Claudius. It is hardly necessary to cite official letters and edicts in Greek; see for instances those collected in Ehrenberg and Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, 299ff. Imperial rescripts are often cited in Greek in the Digest (e.g. L. vi. 5, §§ 2, 6). For the use of Greek in the courts we have the evidence of papyri (e.g. Mitteis, *Chrestomathie*, II. 372). For the recruitments of the eastern legions, see Parker, *The Roman Legions*, pp. 181–3 (cf. Forni, *Il reclutamento delle legioni*, for a detailed analysis). Examples of soldiers' letters in Greek are *BGU* 423, 814.

the only law of the Empire. In practice the *Constitutio* for some time made little change in the East; there were not enough notaries, barristers, or jurisconsults who knew Roman law. Documents continued to be drawn in the old Greek forms, and a clause was added to each converting it into a Roman *stipulatio*.³

So far from encouraging Romanization the government favored Hellenization in the surviving backward areas of barbarism. The main evidence for this is its activity in founding Greek cities. The eastern provinces came to be littered with Sebasteias and Sebastopolises, Claudiopolises, Flaviopolises, Trajanopolises, and Hadrianopolises; scarcely an emperor was not commemorated by a city or two, and some by many more. As in the Hellenistic age, dynastic titles are tricky evidence. It is hard to tell in most cases whether the initiative came from above or from below, and what was the significance of the new name. It might be merely complimentary, an expression by the city of its devotion to an emperor, or a reward given to a city by an emperor for its loyalty. It might celebrate an imperial benefaction, such as financial aid after a fire or an earthquake. But it might be more significant, denoting the reorganization, whether spontaneously or by imperial initiative, of a primitive tribal commune as a city, or the grant of self-government to a town which had hitherto been subject to a dynast or belonged to a centrally administered kingdom. Finally, a dynastic name might celebrate the physical creation of a new city, usually in a rural area hitherto centrally administered.

It may be doubted whether the motives of the Roman government in founding cities were always purely idealistic. Dynasts were liable to be troublesome, because they or their heirs might be incompetent or unruly; a self-governing city was a more stable and responsible unit of government. For practical reasons the Romans also disliked centralized governments, which they found difficulty in running efficiently themselves, and preferred to devolve the administration on to self-governing communities. The policy of devolution goes back to republican days, when Pompey divided the kingdom of Pontus into eleven city states, some of which were the old Greek colonies of the coast, others royal administrative centers, others again entirely new creations; to those last Pompey gave names celebrating their founder's *nomen* and *cognomen*, Pompeiopolis, Magnopolis, Megalopolis. Under the principate the attempt was often made to preserve the bureaucratic régime of an annexed kingdom, but such attempts were never successful in the long term. Thrace, annexed under Claudius, was converted into a group of cities by Trajan and Hadrian. In Cappadocia and Judaea the area of centralized administration was gradually reduced by successive city foundations. In Egypt the Ptolemaic administrative machine, which was fiscally highly profitable if efficiently run, was preserved

³ It is in fact only in Egypt that we have any knowledge of the law prevailing in the provinces; see Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*. For Roman wills drawn in Greek, see § 15 of the Gnomon of the Idios Logos (*BGU* 1210). It has been doubted whether the *Constitutio Antoniniana* did make all free inhabitants of the Empire citizens, and whether it made them subject to Roman law, but in my view wrongly; see my *Studies in Roman Government and Law*, p. 129ff, and Jolowicz, *Historical Introduction to Roman Law*², pp. 545–7. For the mechanical use of the formula of *stipulatio*, see Jolowicz, *op. cit.* pp. 423, 546.

for over two centuries, but eventually a modified form of city government was introduced by Septimius Severus.⁴

Whatever its motives, however, the foundation of a city usually did something to promote Hellenization. If a town was erected *de novo* it became with its gymnasium, theatre, stadium, and other urban amenities, a center of Greek life. If a pre-existing town was granted self-government, it was thereby enabled to create such amenities for itself if they were lacking, and to improve and expand them if it possessed some or all of them already. It can, at any rate, be claimed that, either by the direct initiative of the Roman government or with its blessing and assistance, a number of small enclaves of rural barbarism were urbanized and thereby Hellenized, and several large areas, notably Thrace and northern and eastern Asia Minor, were endowed with cities which served as centers of Hellenization.

At the same time that it was founding new cities the Roman Government was unwittingly sapping the foundations of the city state throughout the Empire. The life of the city depended on autonomy, enjoyed in the present or at least hoped for in the future, and autonomy meant, to put the matter crudely, liberty for each city to fight its neighbors whenever it wished, and liberty for the citizens to struggle with one another by constitutional means or by violence for control of the government. Both had been possible in the Hellenistic period. Most kings were not so powerful but that a combination of cities could defy them, and the cities could still exploit for their own advantage the frequent wars between rival kingdoms or rival claimants for the crown. The predominant form of constitution in the Hellenistic age was democratic, and the kings imposed their control more by means of governors and garrisons than by constitutional restrictions on democratic liberty.

Even while the Roman republic was subduing the Hellenistic monarchies there was still hope. To us, with our knowledge of what was to come, the advance of Rome seems irresistible and inevitable, but contemporary Greeks had not the power of prophecy. Rhodes, and many of the cities of mainland Greece, hoped that the Third Macedonian war would result in a balance of power between Rome and Macedon, and trimmed their sails accordingly. In the middle of the second century the Achaean League endeavored to assert its liberty of action and challenged Roman authority. Even in the first century most of the Greek cities of Asia, and many of those of Greece itself, must have believed that Mithridates would prevail, and actually supported him. It was only gradually—probably after Pompey's vast conquests—that it came to be realized that Rome was invincible and that her rule was universal and had come to stay. Thenceforth the Greek cities had to recognize that in their external affairs they would never again be free.⁵

The Romans distrusted democracy, and believed the government would be more stable if vested in the better sort of citizens, whom they identified with

⁴ See my *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, pp. 10–22 (Thrace), 157–60 (Pontus), 177–83 (Cappadocia), 274–81 (Judaea), 311–38 (Egypt).

⁵ The sentiments of the Greeks during the Third Macedonian War are well described by Polybius (xxvii. 9. 10). For the welcome given to Mithridates, see Appian, *Mith.* 20–3, 28–9.

the richer. They no doubt also calculated that men of property, who had more to lose, would be less likely to take the risks involved in rebellion. They generally, therefore, imposed on cities which came under their control property qualifications for office and for membership of the council, and strengthened the council by giving its members life tenure. External forms were not altered. The popular assembly still met and elected the magistrates and passed decrees. But control passed to the propertied class. This policy goes back to Rome's earliest contact with Greece. After the Second Macedonian War Flamininus imposed the rule on the Thessalians and the other Greek peoples whom he freed from Macedonian rule. It was applied to all the rebellious cities of Greece in 146 B.C. and we find it in Asia, Bithynia and, it would seem, throughout the Greek world. Thenceforth oligarchies ruled the cities, and any attempt of the populace to challenge this dominance was "sedition," and was, as such, forcibly repressed by the provincial governor.⁶

The Greek city state thus sank to the status of a municipality, and even in its internal government all vital political activity was stifled. The spirit of civic patriotism nevertheless long survived the political demise of the city. Now that they were no longer allowed to fight one another, the cities pursued their feuds in ways which were less destructive, but were at best somewhat futile and tended to become economically unhealthy. They conducted bitter and long drawn out diplomatic battles for empty titles and points of precedence, bombarding the imperial government with embassies. But above all they strove to outshine one another in the magnificence of their public buildings and the splendor of their festivals. In their mutual rivalry they strained their economic resources, initiating huge theatres and baths which they were unable to complete, and offering extravagant prizes to attract the most celebrated athletes and artists to their games. Eventually the imperial government had to intervene; the permission of the provincial governor was required for all important building projects, iselastic games (those, that is, that carried the same privileges to victors as the Olympian and the other Panhellenic games) could be founded only by imperial authorization; and finally imperial commissioners (*curatores* or *λογισταί*) were appointed, at first sporadically and temporarily, eventually as a permanent and universal institution, to control the internal finances of each city.⁷

Internal politics followed a similar evolution. An ambitious young man, as

⁶ Livy, XXXIV. 51, *a censu maxime et senatum et iudices legit, potentioresque eam pariem civitatum fecit cui salva tranquillaque omnia magis esse expediebat* (Flamininus), Pausanias, VII. xvi. 9, δημοκρατίας μὲν ἔπαις, καθίστατο δὲ ἀπό τιμημάτων τὰς ἀρχάς (Mummius). Life tenure of councillors in Asia is implied by Cicero, *pro Flacco*, 42 ff. For Bithynia the rules of the Lex Pompeia are cited in Pliny, *Ep.* X. 79, 112, 114. A similar system, whereby local censors enrolled the city-councils, is implied by *IGR* III. 930, τιμητεύσας τὴν βουλήν, for Cyprus, and by *IGR* III. 179, 206, for Galatia. For the suppression of "sedition," see Dittenberger, *Syll.*³, 684, Cicero, *ad Quintum fratrem*, I. 1 § 25. Cf. also Cassius Dio, LII. 30.

⁷ For feuds between cities, see Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* XXXIV, XXXVIII, XL. For a dispute about titles between Ephesus, Pergamum, and Smyrna, see Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ 849; cf. also Cassius Dio, LII. 37 § 10. On competitive expenditure on buildings and games, see Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* XL. 10, Cassius Dio, LII. 30 § 3. For imperial control of buildings, see Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* XL. 6, XLV. 15, *Dig.* L. viii. 7 § 1, x. 3, 6, 7, and Pliny, *Ep.* X, *passim*; of games, Pliny, *Ep.* X. 118–9, *IGR* IV. 336, 1251, 1431. On imperial *curatores*, see my *Greek City*, pp. 136–8.

Plutarch regretfully remarks, could no longer win renown by leading his citizens to victory in war, by negotiating a treaty, by suppressing a tyrant or by reforming the constitution. He might, it is true, still make his name by going on an embassy to the emperor and by a brilliant speech gaining for his city the title of "first of the province," or the privilege of being an assize town. But in general rival politicians could win popularity only by outbidding one another in their munificent expenditure on games and buildings, or on largesse to the people. Political rivalry ran so high that less opulent contestants not infrequently squandered their entire fortunes in the struggle; in which case the city was allowed, contrary to the usual rule which forbade *ex gratia* payments from public funds, to vote them a pension. Ultimately the standard of expenditure expected of aspirants to the magistracies and to seats on the council became so high that even wealthy citizens became reluctant to hold them. The rule was enforced that a candidate must accept nomination (which was automatically followed by election) unless he could plead some legal exemption, and a search for exemptions began. This development is very difficult to date and was by no means uniform. In some cities it had already begun in the first century, it became more widespread in the second, and by the early third seems, to judge by the elaborate rules laid down by the Severan lawyers, to have been generally prevalent. Long after that date, even in the fourth and fifth centuries, there were still some patriotic citizens who voluntarily accepted office and spent lavishly in producing games. But, broadly speaking, it is probably true to say that by the third century the Greek city state and the feverish patriotism which it had inspired was dead. The cities had become mere units of local administration and their government was a compulsory burden imposed on their richer citizens.⁸

Though they died politically, the cities retained, and indeed enhanced, their importance as centers of Hellenic culture. Most cities now maintained higher education from their public funds, appointing professors of grammar and rhetoric and paying them regular salaries as well as according them various immunities. A ruling of Antoninus Pius limited the number of public professors; an ordinary city might have three grammarians and three rhetors, the capital of an assize district four of each, a metropolis five. In these schools a literary education was supplied according to the norm laid down in the Hellenistic age, but the curriculum became increasingly narrowed, and more and more emphasis was thrown on rhetoric. The corpus of classical literature which was taught in schools and generally used by the cultivated public tended to be more and more a selection, the seven best plays of each of three best Attic tragedians, for instance, and there was a growing use of florilegia.⁹

The expansion of education promoted by the cities was reflected in the wider diffusion of literary production to areas hitherto barren. The majority of

⁸ Plutarch's *Praecepta rei publicae gerundae*, directed to a young man of modest means who wishes to enter local politics, is very revealing of the heavy demands made by the public on politicians' purses. For pensions to ruined decurions, see Pliny, *E.p.* X. 90–1, *Dig.* L. ii. 8. For the introduction of compulsion to fill the magistracies, see my *Greek City*, pp. 181–91.

⁹ For the numbers of civic professors, see *Dig.* XXVII. i. 6 § 2, and for their salaries, L. ix. 4 § 2.

authors naturally came from the old established centers of Hellenism, but now even Samosata on the Euphrates on the extreme eastern fringe of the Empire produced the notable satirist Lucian, and the very Syrian city of Emisa, with its archaic oriental cult of Elagabalus, the novelist Heliodorus. Oppian, the poet of fishing and hunting, came from Anazarbus in the backward hinterland of Cilicia, still under the early principate ruled by the native dynast Tarcondimotus, and in the heart of Asia Minor, Laranda of Lycaonia produced the epic poets Nestor and his son Pisander. One of the most celebrated rhetors of the second century, Aelius Aristides, hailed from the remote Mysian city of Hadrianutherae. It is at any rate a curious coincidence, if not more, that literary production corresponds closely with the development of cities. The recently urbanized areas of Pontus and Thrace were unproductive, and the few Cappadocian literary figures came from the old foundations of Ariarathes the Philhellene, Tyana, and Caesarea Mazaca. In Egypt, outside Alexandria, the only notable authors were the great astronomer and mathematician Claudius Ptolemy of Ptolemais, and the author of the *Deipnosophistae*, Athenaeus of Naucratis. The metropoleis of the nomes were barren until in the third century Lycopolis gave birth to the great philosopher Plotinus.

The cities also encouraged music and drama by the many competitions which they celebrated. The theatre had, even in the Hellenistic age, been professionalized. The poets, actors, singers, and instrumentalists formed regional unions, and toured the cities of a given area. In the Roman period, probably under Trajan, these regional unions were amalgamated into one "holy oecumenical synod of the artists in the service of Dionysus." They were paid for their performances, and the victor also received prizes.¹⁰

Athletics were likewise fostered by the cities. Every city had at least one gymnasium, and some had as many as three, for boys, youths, and old men. Every city celebrated games on various scales of magnificence, comprising chariot races and the traditional athletic events. Athletes always remained in theory amateurs, but some at any rate, to judge by the immense numbers of victories which they won, seem to have become in fact professionals: they were not paid, however, though they could win large sums in prize money, and if victorious in iselastic games were entitled to a pension for life from their native cities.¹¹

In the games some Roman influence penetrated into the Greek East. Gladiatorial shows and combats with wild animals were added to the repertory. The former seem never to have become common, and were abolished by Constantine. The latter became increasingly popular, and were still flourishing in Justinian's day.¹²

¹⁰ For the Dionysiac artists, see Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinwesens*, pp. 129–47 and s.v. *technitae* in *Pauly-Wissowa*, VA, 2473 ff. Their pay is mentioned in *SEG* I. 362, IV. 303, 306, 308, *IG*. IX. i. 694, XII. ix. 207, *Syll.* 3, 1077.

¹¹ On the gymnasia, see Oehler's article in *Pauly-Wissowa*, VII. 2004–26. For the social status of athletes, see *Rev. Arch.* 1934, pp. 55–8; examples of athletes of good family are *IGR* I. 381, III. 500, 623, 625–6, IV. 844, 1344. For the pensions of victors, see Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, I. 157.

¹² For gladiators in the East, see L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Paris, 1940). They were prohibited by *CTh* XV. xii. 1, 325, and are mentioned as a memory of childhood by Libanius

The cities were, moreover, the most important patrons of architecture and sculpture. They built countless temples, triumphal arches, theatres, odea, stadia, gymnasia, nymphaea, and baths, and laid out great colonnaded streets and markets. They commissioned thousands of statues of emperors, imperial officials, and local worthies, until in some cities the streets and squares became congested. On the style of these monuments I will forebear to speak, since others far better qualified than I will discuss the problem later. I need only to remark that oriental survivals were rare in the art of the Roman East; the Egyptian temples continued to be built in the traditional style, and in the border city of Palmyra the sculpture shows Parthian influence, and that is about all. There was much interchange of architects and sculptors between the Greek East and the Roman West, and some Roman techniques and stylistic innovations were transplanted to the East. But the main flow of men and ideas was from East to West, and in general the East seems to have maintained its Greek traditions.

The official civic cults remained as Hellenic as they had been in the Hellenistic age, and perhaps became more so. We can, at any rate, be certain that the shrines of the local gods were fully Greek in their architectural form in the Roman period, for many temples of this period survive; Zeus of Aezani in the heart of Phrygia was housed in a fine Greek temple. Even at Jerusalem Herod the Great gave the unhellenized Jehovah a great temple whose predominant effect was Greek. Only the actual sanctuary was built according to the hallowed prescription of the Scriptures; the complex of courts which surrounded it were in the Corinthian order. And Herod's temple was greatly admired by the Jewish people, suspicious as they were of anything Hellenic.¹³

But, at the same time, the Roman age saw the wide diffusion of a number of very oriental cults, the so-called mystery religions. The Egyptian worship of Isis had already begun to spread outside Egypt in the Hellenistic age and now became universal. Mithraism, a Persian cult, spread far and wide, and so also did the worship of the Phrygian Great Mother of the Gods. Judaism seems also to have become widely diffused; we hear of many proselytes in the first century. More significant for the future was the growth of Christianity. There was a steady growth of religiosity throughout the Empire, and especially in the eastern provinces, and this growing religiosity found more satisfaction in the oriental cults than in the official Hellenic or Hellenized gods. Greek philosophy also took on a more religious tone. Both the two new philosophic schools of the Roman period, Neopythagoreanism and Neoplatonism, were strongly infused with religious emotion. How far this religious tone was of oriental inspiration it is difficult to say. Asceticism, contempt for the world of the senses, a craving for mystical contemplation of and union with the divine,

(*Or. I. 5*); there is no later allusion to them in the East. For the popularity of wild beast hunts, see Libanius, *Ep. 1399*; he wrote many letters asking for their supply for games given by his friends (*Ep. 217-9, 544, 586-8, 598-9, 1231-2, 1399, 1400*). Civic beast shows are still mentioned in *CJ XI. xli. 5* (where "bestias" has been interpolated by Justinian's editors into a law dealing with charioteers and horses).

¹³ Josephus. *Ant. Jud. XV. 391-420* (see especially 414 for the use of the Corinthian order).

can all be traced to a pure Hellenic source in Plato. But the strong emotional emphasis on these features of Platonism may be due to oriental influences.¹⁴

The Greek East imposed the Hellenistic concept of the monarchy on the Empire at large. Under the republic the Greeks were somewhat at sea. They could, and very often did, worship the goddess Roma, but so abstract a conception does not seem to have satisfied them. Alternatively they could worship their provincial governors, and this they regularly did. But the provision of temples and festivals for an annual series of proconsuls had obviously practical difficulties, especially on the financial side, and these cults were rarely enduring. Some proconsuls who had been notable benefactors to the provinces were long worshipped: the cult of Mucius Scaevola by the cities of Asia struck firm roots. But in general the worship of proconsuls became one of the many devices whereby provincial governors fleeced their subjects; a fund was raised and the new god pocketed it.¹⁵

Octavian's emergence as sole ruler of the Roman world was thus greeted with relief. In him the Greek East forthwith saw a king—the Greeks were not interested in the nicely adjusted republican formulae on which his authority was officially based—and they forthwith hastened to worship him. Directly after Actium the Greek cities of Asia and Bithynia asked leave of Octavian to build temples to him in their respective provinces, and to celebrate his cult in provincial festivals. Octavian insisted that Rome should be associated with himself as the object of cult, and very soon nearly every eastern province was celebrating the worship of Rome and Augustus. The cult was so obviously a useful means of focussing the loyalty of the provincials to the head of the Empire that Augustus transplanted it to the barbarian western provinces, and altars of Rome and Augustus were soon inaugurated at Lyons and Cologne, where the notables of the Gallic and German tribes met and celebrated the worship of the Emperor.¹⁶

To the Emperor likewise the Greeks transferred the Hellenistic philosophic doctrine of the kingship and of the royal virtues which the ideal king should cultivate. It is in fact from the Roman period that we derive the earliest extant examples of this literature in the series of orations on kingship produced by Dio Chrysostom and the other notable rhetors of the Greek East.¹⁷

The imperial cult and these orations, notably the great panegyric of Aelius Aristides on Rome, accurately reflect the feeling of the Greeks to the Roman Empire during this period. The Greeks were not—with a few exceptions—legally Roman citizens, full members of the commonwealth. They were, and felt themselves to be, passive beneficiaries of Roman rule. The emperor was ideally, and to a large extent in practice, their great savior and benefactor,

¹⁴ See A. D. Nock's admirable chapter on "The Development of Paganism in the Roman Empire" in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, XII. xii.

¹⁵ On the cult of Rome, see Livy, XLIII. 6, Tacitus, *Annals*, IV. 56; on that of proconsuls Cicero, *ad Quintum fratrem*, I. i § 26, *ad Atticum*, V. 21, *ad Fam.* III. 7, *pro Flacco*, 55ff.

¹⁶ Suetonius, *Augustus*, 52, *templa, quamvis sciret etiam proconsulibus decerni solere, in nulla tamen provincia nisi communi suo Romaeque nomine recepit*; Cassius Dio, LI. 20 (Asia and Bithynia), Suetonius, *Claudius*, 2, Strabo, IV. 192 (Gaul), Tacitus, *Annals* I. 59 (Germany).

¹⁷ Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* I-IV, Aelius Aristeides, *Or.* XXVI.

who with his legions protected them from the barbarians and through his governors maintained internal peace. The Romans were the aristocracy who governed and guarded the provincials under the emperor's supreme command. Under the protecting aegis of Rome the Greek cities were enabled to live their own life, developing and expanding their Hellenic culture, building yet more splendid temples to their gods, yet more schools and gymnasia wherein they perfected their intellectual and physical education, yet more theatres and stadia wherein they celebrated yet more magnificent festivals of drama, music, and athletic prowess. For all this they felt profound gratitude to Rome and the emperor, but they regarded them as external benefactors, to be worshipped and celebrated in panegyrics. Like the immortal gods the emperors needed no help in their task, they required only due honor from their subjects. The loyalty of the Greeks to the Empire was in fact completely passive, and Rome evoked no active patriotism.

In the course of the late third and early fourth centuries a number of changes occurred in the Empire which had profound effects on the Greek East. One of the more important of these for our purposes was the gradual decay of Greek culture among the Roman governing class. In the first place the emperors tended at this period to be military men of relatively humble origins drawn from the less cultivated areas of the Latin West, particularly from Illyricum. Such men knew no Greek themselves, and they employed as their ministers and governors men of similar origins. Constantine indeed, having spent his boyhood at Diocletian's court in the East, knew some Greek—he could understand and even intervene in the debates at Nicaea, and the Theodosian Code has preserved a fragment of the acts of the imperial consistory in which he argues with a Greek litigant. But his native language was Latin—he was born at Naissus in the Latin speaking province of Dacia—and he preferred to give his opening address to the Council of Nicaea in Latin and had the theological treatises which Eusebius of Caesarea wrote for his edification translated into Latin. For his negotiations with the eastern Christian sects he employed a bilingual Antiochene, Strategius, who became his indispensable assistant in religious affairs, and rose to become the *comes Musonianus*. Of the later emperors of the eastern parts the Pannonian Valens knew little or no Greek, nor, probably, did the Spaniard Theodosius. These Emperors moreover imported many of their own countrymen to the East. Numerous boorish and illiterate (as far as Greek went) Pannonians came in Valens' train; Libanius complains that several governors of Syria, including the notorious Festus of Tridentum, knew no Greek. Two of Theodosius' pretorian prefects of the East, Cynegius and Rufinus, were westerners, hailing from Spain and Gaul respectively; Rufinus had to have Libanius' letters to him translated into Latin. The court of Constantinople thus continued to the end of the fourth century to be predominantly Latin speaking and many high officials spoke no Greek.¹⁸

¹⁸ For Constantine at Nicaea, see Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, III. 13, *Theod. HE*. I. 12; in the consistory, *CTh VIII. xv. 1*; Eusebius' works translated into Latin, Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, IV. 35. For Strategius Musonianus, see Ammianus Marcellinus, XV. xiii. 1. That Valens knew no Greek appears from Themistius, *Or. IX. 126b*. For Festus and Rufinus, see Lib. *Or. I. 156, Ep. 865*.

Apart from this social change Greek withered away in the West even in the most cultivated circles. We cannot trace the chronology of the change, but by the second half of the fourth century even so polished an aristocrat as Symmachus confesses that he had to rub up his schoolboy Greek to help his son in his lessons. And so learned a man as Augustine, deeply interested in Greek philosophy and theology, never mastered Greek, using translations and occasionally, it would seem, spelling out a sentence or two with the aid of a lexicon. Boys still learned Greek at school, but they ceased to read Greek literature, and soon became rusty. By this date, then, even cultivated Romans of the West who took up posts in the eastern parts could not speak Greek or even read it with ease.¹⁹

The establishment of a second capital at Constantinople thus had the rather anomalous effect of making it necessary for the Greeks of the eastern parts to learn Latin if they aspired to high imperial offices or wished to penetrate court society. Those with rather humbler ambitions also had to acquire Latin. The central imperial ministries, including the praetorian prefecture of the East, conducted their business in Latin. Latin, moreover, became more and more desirable, if not indispensable, for barristers. Proceedings in court were, it is true, still conducted in Greek, but knowledge of Roman law was coming to be expected from the bar, and the teaching of Roman law and the texts from which it was taught were all in Latin. Libanius complained that in the old days a barrister was primarily an orator who pled his client's case in eloquent Greek; if he wanted to clarify a technical point of law he went to a jurisconsult—a very inferior person—for advice. Nowadays a barrister was expected to be learned in the law himself.²⁰

To Libanius these changes seemed to sound the death knell of the traditional Greek literary and rhetorical education. Parents, he bitterly lamented, sent their sons to Beirut or to Rome to learn Latin and law. Greek culture was useless for the man of ambition. He needed Latin to secure a place in the higher civil service, or to practice with success at the bar. If he had loftier ambitions, he needed Latin to gain the ear of the great men at court who controlled patronage.²¹

As a result not only the elementary but the higher teaching of Latin received a considerable impetus in the Greek East. Under Diocletian Lactantius taught Latin rhetoric at Nicomedia, then the imperial residence, and in the university of Constantinople which was founded by Theodosius II there were as many Latin as Greek grammarians—ten of each—and three Latin rhetors to five Greek.²² One very curious result of the new situation was that Greeks sometimes wrote literary works in Latin, hoping thereby to be read in high society.

¹⁹ Symm. *Ep.* IV. 20. For Augustine's Greek, see H. I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*², 27–46, 631–7.

²⁰ For Latin in the praetorian prefecture of the East, see Joh. Lydus, *Mag.* II. 12, III. 42; for rhetors and jurisconsults, *Lib. Or.* II. 43–4.

²¹ Libanius complains of the abandonment of Greek for Latin and the law in *Or.* I. 214, 234, II. 43–4, XLVIII. 22–3, *Ep.* 951, 957.

²² For Lactantius, see Jerome, *de viris illustribus*, 88; for the university of Cptle. *CTh XIV. ix. 3*, 425.

Ammianus of Antioch composed his great history in Latin, and Claudian of Alexandria was the author of Latin poetry. Another result was that a number of Latin words found their way into vulgar Greek—chiefly administrative and legal terms such as δοῦξ, κόμης, or πτεκούλιον. No-one who aspired to literary elegance would deign to use such words; Libanius, rather than sully his lips with βικάριος regularly uses the cumbersome periphrasis “ruler of several peoples” (πλειόνων ἔθνῶν ἀρχῶν). Athanasius, who had no literary pretensions, is guilty of ἀγεντιστιρήβους (*agentes in rebus*). But Libanius insists on “those who carry the king’s letters” (οἱ τὰ βασιλέως γράμματα φέροντες).²³

This dominance of Latin was transitory and left little permanent effect on the Greek culture of the East. Under Arcadius and Theodosius II, who had been born and bred at Constantinople, the court became Hellenized, and after the division of the Empire in 395 few westerners migrated to the eastern parts. Cyrus, praetorian prefect of the East in the middle of the fifth century, himself a Greek poet of some distinction, abolished the use of Latin in the praetorian prefecture. Legal textbooks were compiled in Greek, and Roman law seems to have been taught in Greek by the latter years of the fifth century. Latin was required only in the *sacra scrinia*, since imperial constitutions were issued in Latin as well as Greek: John Lydus learned the language with the object of entering that distinguished ministry. But John’s Latin, of which he was inordinately proud, was very elementary. Constitutions were in practice drafted in Greek, and the official Latin translation is often incorrect. Despite Libanius’ gloomy fears, the ancient tradition of Greek grammatical and rhetorical education was maintained unimpaired not only in the major universities—if I may use a convenient if incorrect term—of Athens, Alexandria, and Constantinople, but by the official, salaried professors which all major cities still maintained, and by many private teachers. In this period literary culture received a yet wider extension, permeating the few backward areas that still survived under the principate. The cities of Egypt at last produced historians and poets, Olympiodorus of Thebes and Nonnus of Panopolis to name only the two most distinguished, and Cappadocia produced not only Basil of Caesarea, but Gregory from the minor provincial city of Nazianzus. Even Paphlagonia gave birth to the great orator Themistius.²⁴

The physical side of education languished in a Christian environment. The last ephebic games of which we know took place at Oxyrhynchus in 323, the year before Constantine’s conquest of the east. A gymnasiarch last appears in

²³ Athanasius is much addicted to Latinisms, being guilty not only of ἀγεντιστιρήβους (*Apol. ad Const.* 10) but of δοῦξ, μάγιστρος, κόμης and παλάτιον in the same chapter, βῆλον in chapter 3, and κομεντάρια in chapter 29 of the same work. Latin words are naturally most common in the administrative jargon of the civil service (they abound in John Lydus and Justinian’s novels), but are also frequent in the vulgar Greek of the papyri and of John Malalas. They are sedulously avoided by Libanius, Procopius and all authors of literary pretensions. See *Lib. Or.* II. 58, XLVIII. 7, LXII. 14, for periphrases for *agentes in rebus*.

²⁴ For Cyrus’s reform, see John Lydus, *Mag.* II. 12, III. 42, and for the adoption of Greek in the law schools Collinet, *Histoire de l’école de droit de Beyrouth*, p. 211 ff. John Lydus evidently learned Latin with a view to gaining a place among the *memoriales* of the *sacra scrinia* (*Mag.* III. 26). By the end of the sixth century Gregory the Great (*Ep.* VII. 27) complained that there was no-one at Constantinople who could translate Latin competently.

370 in the same city. Athletic contests still formed part of the Antiochene Olympia in the last years of the fourth century. Thereafter we hear of athletes no more: the church preferred the "athletes of God," who starved their bodies into submission. Gladiatorial contests also disappeared, banned by Constantine under Christian influence. Musical games survived, and indeed flourished, in the form of the mime, whose themes were still drawn from Greek mythology. Above all, chariot racing and the Roman import of wild beast fights excited the passions of the crowd.²⁵

Roman law gradually prevailed in the Greek East. Its acceptance in the actual practice of the courts was presumably gradual. But it seems to have been systematically enforced by Diocletian. This, at any rate, is the conclusion that I would draw from the vast mass of rescripts which that Emperor issued on often elementary points of law. Litigants by now, it would seem, were anxious to know what their rights and liabilities were under Roman law, and put their cases to the emperors. The emperor, or rather his legal secretariat, provided answers which enlightened not only the barrister conducting the case, but the judge before whom it was tried. Roman law thus came to be generally known and followed. But it underwent in the process a certain infiltration of Greek legal practices and doctrines, which either survived by tacit custom or were formally written into the law by imperial constitutions. Particularly in the realm of family law a large Greek element was thus absorbed into the Roman system; in Justinian's legislation, for instance, the Greek rules about dowries have superseded the Roman, and the Greek institution of *donatio ante nuptias* has been received into the law.²⁶

Oriental influences have been postulated in the development of late Roman art. Not being an expert I hesitate to speak on this subject, but I am bound to say that I am sceptical. What we know from indubitable archaeological and historical sources is that there was during the troubled period of the third century a great falling off, one might almost say a hiatus, in monumental architecture and sculpture. As a result, architects, sculptors, and other skilled craftsmen found little employment and the inherited tradition of skill was well nigh broken. In 334 Constantine complained in one of his laws that architects were not to be found, and granted state scholarships to young men to receive training in the profession. In 337 he bestowed immunities on a large range of skilled craftsmen—sculptors, painters, mosaicists, wood carvers, and the like—to encourage them to train their sons in their respective crafts. That Constantine's complaints were justified is vividly demonstrated by the absurdly childish sculptures executed for his own triumphal arch at Rome, which are surely the crude efforts of simple monumental masons to produce large compositions.²⁷

²⁵ The last ephebic games are recorded in *P. Oxy.* 42, the last gymnasiarch in *P. Oxy.* 2110. For athletes at the Antiochene Olympia, see Lib. *Or.* X, *passim*, and *Ep.* 843, 1179–83, 1278–9. For gladiators and *venationes*, see *supra*, note 12. Libanius defends the mime as preserving the pagan myths in *Or.* LXIV.

²⁶ See Jolowicz, *Historical Introduction to Roman Law*², p. 522 ff.

²⁷ *CTh XIII. iv.* 1, 334 (architects), 2, 337 (craftsmen).

I am not suggesting that late Roman art continued to be primitive. What I am inclined to think is that the highly sophisticated techniques of Hellenistic and Roman art were, to a large extent, lost in the dark age of the late third and early fourth centuries, and that this loss liberated artists from a tradition which was growing sterile, and enabled them to make a fresh start. Their initial efforts were crude, but had a certain primitive vigor and dignity. With the recovery of technical expertise their work acquired refinement and delicacy, but retained the rather rigid formalism of their simple beginnings, which evidently appealed to contemporary taste.

What I have said applies especially to sculpture and the decorative arts, which were purely traditional crafts, taught by fathers to their sons, or masters to their apprentices. Architecture, on the other hand, was a liberal art—it is worthy of note that Constantine offered his scholarships only to young men who had completed their standard literary and rhetorical education—and while it too was taught by apprenticeship, it was based on theoretical text books. Most of the buildings of the later Empire were, it is true, unambitious in design—the wooden roofed, aisled basilica which was the standard church plan is, after all structurally very simple. But the science of *mechanice*, being enshrined in books, was preserved, and *mechanici*, who ranked higher than ordinary *architecti*, could thus design complex vaulted buildings, and in Justinian's reign excelled their Hellenistic and Roman forebears in the boldness and subtlety of their vaults and domes.²⁸

The greatest change which the Empire underwent in the early fourth century was, of course, the conversion of Constantine and the consequent rise of Christianity to be the dominant and eventually the sole religion of the Roman world. The change was gradual, and still not quite complete in the sixth century. John of Ephesus found many thousands of rustic pagans to baptize in Asia, Lydia, and Caria, lands where the propagation of Christianity had begun in apostolic days, and in the highest classes of society at Constantinople itself purges held under Justinian and Tiberius Constantine revealed a substantial number of crypto-pagans, especially among intellectuals. The city of Carrhae in Mesopotamia was still predominantly pagan when it passed under Arab rule, and in the coastal mountains of Syria the sect of Nusseiri to this day preserve a faith which is basically neoplatonic.²⁹

By and large, however, the Greek East was conquered by a religion which was in origin and essence oriental. Christianity, it is true, assimilated many Greek elements in the course of its early history. From the first it adopted the Greek language: its Old Testament was the Septuagint, and its own holy books were initially written in Greek. In the development of its theology it made use of the concepts of Greek philosophy. But it was based on Jewish monotheism and the teaching of a Jewish Messiah.

²⁸ See the very interesting account of Anthemius of Tralles in Agathias, V. 6ff.

²⁹ For the mission in Asia, see John of Ephesus, *Hist. Eccl.* II. 44, III. 36–7, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, xl, xliii, xvii; for purges among the aristocracy, Malalas, 449, Joh. Eph. *HE* III. 27ff.; for Carrhae and the Nusairi, *Encyclopedia of Islam*, II. 270, III. 964–5.

The acceptance of Christianity inevitably affected the theory of the monarchy; a Christian emperor could no longer be a god. Here Christianity was to some extent anticipated by pagan thought. With the growth of monotheistic or pantheistic ideas in the more philosophical and intellectual levels of pagan religious thought, the emperor tended to be regarded not as God but rather as the special protégé of the supreme divinity, or as being more deeply infused with the divine element than common men. It is perhaps significant that the gods are in the coinage of the tetrarchy styled companions (*comites*) or preservers (*conservatores*) of the emperors, and that Diocletian claimed to be not Jupiter Optimus Maximus but Iovius. This concept was adopted by Christianity. Eusebius of Caesarea, in the panegyric which he delivered to celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of Constantine's accession, works out with elaborate—and to modern ears almost blasphemous—detail, the analogy between the Father and the Son, and the Son and his representative and vicegerent on earth, the emperor.³⁰

This change did nothing to diminish the divine aura which surrounded the emperor's person. Everything connected with him remained sacred and divine, so much so that an imperial constitution was colloquially called a *σακρά* in Greek. Any resistance to his will continued to be sacrilege. The official imperial cult continued to be celebrated in the provinces; Constantine expressly authorized the province of Umbria to build "a temple dedicated to our name," to elect its own priest and to hold theatrical and gladiatorial games, only stipulating that his temple "shall not be polluted with the falsehoods of any contagious superstition." Down to the sixth century the provincial assemblies continued to meet, and under the presidency of a *sacerdos* to celebrate games in the emperor's honor; only the sacrifices were abolished.³¹

The monarchy was during this period modified by both western and eastern influences. On the one hand, Diocletian at last succeeded in achieving what Alexander the Great had attempted six centuries earlier, the introduction of Persian royal robes and ceremonies, in particular *proskynesis* or, as it was styled in Latin, *adoratio*. On the other hand, the reception of Roman law carried with it a greatly diluted republican view of the imperial office. The emperor's will was law because the people had conferred upon him the plenitude of sovereign power. This doctrine acquired practical importance only in an interregnum, when the election of an emperor devolved upon the people, as represented by "the palace, the senate and the army." In the western parts, from which this doctrine originated, election was never more than the formal ratification of a usurpation. In the eastern parts genuine elections conferred the imperial power on Jovian, Valentinian, Leo, Anastasius, and Justin I.³²

³⁰ Eusebius, *de laudibus Constantini*, *passim*.

³¹ Constantine's temple, Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. Sel.* 705. That the *sacerdotium provinciae* still existed under Justinian appears from *Cod. Just.* V. xxvii. 1 where the words are explained, *id est*, *Phoenicarchiae vel Syriarchiae*. For the games attached to the latter office, see *Cod. Just.* I. xxxvi. 1.

³² For *adoratio*, see Eutropius, IX. 26, Aurelius Victor, *de Caesaribus*, xxxix. 2 ff. The republican doctrine is enunciated in *Inst. I. ii. 6*, cf. *Dig. I. iv. pr.* (Ulpian). Imperial elections: Amm. Marc. XXV. v, XXVI. i, Const. Porph. *Cer.* I. 91–3. In the West Majorian (*Nov. i*) claimed: *imperatorem me factum, patres conscripti, vestrae electionis arbitrio et fortissimi exercitus ordinatione cognoscite*.

The people of the Greek East had legally become Roman citizens in A.D. 212. By the fourth century they seem to have felt themselves to be Romans, laying claim both to the cultural heritage of Greece and the political heritage of Rome. But their basic attitude to the Empire did not change. They still regarded the emperor as a divinely appointed ruler, who, with his armies, protected them against the barbarians. In return they owed him reverence, obedience—and “the sacred taxes.” However, if the emperor’s armies failed to defend them, they felt no obligation to fight for the Empire themselves, but submitted helplessly to barbarian rule. The Roman Empire had not yet evoked any active and positive patriotism.

Before I summarize my conclusions there is one important point that I would like to emphasize—the thinness of the veneer of Hellenism which the Near East acquired. Except in the Greek homeland and in limited areas along the western and southern coasts of Asia Minor, where Greek culture had already penetrated deeply long before Alexander’s day, Hellenism remained throughout the thousand years in which the Near East was governed by Macedonian kings and philhellenic emperors an upper class monopoly. Everywhere the peasantry continued to speak their native tongues, and even in the towns the lower classes knew little Greek and normally used the indigenous language. The evidence is abundant for Syria and Egypt. To quote a few typical instances only, John Chrysostom speaks of the country folk, including the rural clergy, who flocked to Antioch for the Easter festival, as a people of alien speech. Publius of Zeugma, who founded a Greek-speaking monastery in the neighboring desert, was approached by Syriac speaking postulants, and eventually organized a double community in which worship was conducted separately in Greek and Syriac. Procopius, the first martyr of the Diocletianic persecution in Palestine, was reader of the church of Scythopolis, whose duty it was to translate the liturgy into Syriac for the benefit of townsmen who knew no Greek. In Egypt the abbot Apollonius picked those of his monks who knew both Greek and Egyptian to accompany a party of Greek visitors on the next stage of their tour and to act as interpreters.³³

As Christianity penetrated more and more into rural areas the church felt the need of providing the converts with versions of the Scripture and the liturgy and other Christian literature written in their native language. In Syria there was no great difficulty, for in Mesopotamia a continuous literary tradition of Syriac had been preserved. A rich Christian-Syriac literature, both translations and original works, was already in being, and could be used by the humbler converts in Syria. In Egypt, on the other hand, the demotic script had died out in the third century. The Greek alphabet, with the addition of a few demotic letters, was adapted to the Egyptian language, and the Scriptures, the liturgy, and some simple hagiographical literature was thus made available to Egyptian peasants and humble townsfolk. When Syria and Egypt fell to the Arabs, Greek survived for a few generations as the administrative lan-

³³ Joh. Chrys. *Hom. ad pop. Ant.* xix. 1; Theod. *Hist. Rel.* v (Publius); Eus. *Mart. Pal.* I. i (Syriac version; Procopius); Rufinus, *Historia Monachorum*, 7 (Apollonius).

guage, but when the Caliphs substituted Arabic for it in the government offices, Greek very soon died out. Syriac and Coptic, on the other hand, survived for centuries, as both written and spoken languages.

The evidence is less abundant for Asia Minor, but here, too, it can be proved that a number of native languages survived in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. Basil of Caesarea alludes in one of his sermons to Cappadocian as a language familiar to many of his congregation. Hagiographical anecdotes of the sixth century reveal that there were still Isaurians and Lycaonians who knew no Greek and spoke only their indigenous tongues. A Galatian monk in Palestine, struck dumb, could when he first recovered his speech speak only in Celtic. In Europe Thracian survived, and in a Thracian monastery in Palestine the liturgy was conducted in the native language. At what date Asia Minor became thoroughly Greek, I do not know, but the process was far from complete in the sixth century.³⁴

If I may attempt to summarize my conclusions, the principate saw the political extinction of the Greek city, but the consolidation of Greek culture. Everywhere Greek education, maintained and subsidized by the cities, flourished among the upper classes, both in its intellectual and its physical aspects. Greek musical and athletic games were widespread as never before. In every city Greek art and architecture were lavishly patronized. The legal system of the East was still Greek. Only in religion were oriental influences on the upgrade; western influence was as yet negligible.

From the fourth century the dominance of Hellenism began to wane. The Byzantine Empire as a result inherited a legal system which was basically Roman, though it incorporated many Greek elements, and a religion which was basically oriental, though its theology was framed in Greek philosophical concepts. The Hellenistic monarchy was given an oriental dress and a Roman constitutional theory. The athletic ideal of Greek culture perished with the physical education and the competitive games in which it was embodied. Only chariot races survived from the ancient athletic games of Greece and with these were coupled Roman, wild beast fights. The musical games survived only in the degenerate form of the mime.

On the other hand, despite the break in the tradition caused by the prolonged troubles of the third century, Hellenistic art survived in a new form: Byzantine art was, unless I am greatly mistaken, a fresh growth from the old stock. Above all, the great corpus of Greek literature, philosophy, mathematics, and science was preserved together with the grammatical and rhetorical discipline of the schools, which ensured that this great heritage continued to be read and appreciated, copied and commented, and that the Greek language, while in its spoken and vulgar forms it underwent the changes which time inevitably brings, lived on as a literary medium in all its purity.

³⁴ Basil, *de Spiritu Sancto*, 29 (Cappadocian); Holl, *Hermes* xlivi (1908), p. 24 ff. (Isaurian and Lycaonian); Jerome, *Comm. in Ep. Gal.* ii, Cyril of Scythopolis, *V. Euthymii*, 55 (Galatian); Gregory of Nyssa, *contra Eunomium*, xii, Joh. Chrys. *Hom. hab. in ecclesia Pauli* (PG, LXIII. 501), Symeon Metaphrastes, *V. Theodori Coenobiarchi*, 9 (Thracian).